	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/686,125	NDILI, AWELE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thong H Vu	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 October 2003</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

1.   Claims 1-26 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/03 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive to overcome the prior art.

Applicant argues the prior art does not teach "a single input entry per page".

Examiner points out applicant defined the first language that allows only single

input per page such as HDML (specification, page 6 –line22-page 7, line 18) and the

network sites or web sites using HTML or CHTML (specification, page 10, lines 15-18).

The prior art discloses the translation server display web pages in standard HTML

[Jamgaard, col 7 lines 12-30] and wireless deivce using XML engine to to convert to a

certain protocols such as WML or HDML [Jamgaard, col 7 lines 30-46, col 8 lines 5-24].

It is clearly that the HDML provides a single entry and HTML provides a plurality of

entries. Thus, the rejection is sustained.

3.   Claims 1-20,24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in

the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schwartz et al [Schwartz

5,327,559]

4.   As per claim 1, Schwartz discloses a system for exchanging communications

between a mobile device and a network site [Schwartz Fig 1], the system comprising:

a conversion engine [link server with converter 318, Schwartz Fig 3A] coupleable

to a mobile device to accept a request for a content from a network site, the request

being signaled from the mobile device in a first language (HDML) and the content being

structured in a second language (cHTML), the conversion engine being coupleable to

the network site to retrieve the content from the network site in response to receiving

the request, the conversion engine including logic to convert the content from the

second language to the first language and signaling the content to be rendered on the

mobile device [Schwartz, mobile device communicates to server using HDML, 9col 8

lines 46-67, col 9 lines 15-40, col 10 lines 3-17, col 11 lines 15-40, col 12 lines 31-68,

col 13 lines 25-38, col 14 line 59-col 15 line 8],

It is clearly that the first language (HDML) provides on the mobile device for a

single input entry per page rendered from the network site [see specification page 17

line 17-page 18 line 3], and the second language (cHTML) allows for multiple input

entries per page rendered from the network site [see specification page 18 lines 4-7].

5.   Claims 14,26 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1.

Therefore, claims 14,26 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

6.   As per claim 2, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine identifies one or more

input entries at the network site, and signals the input entries as selectable links to the

mobile device [col 19 line 49-col 20 line 5].

7.   As per claim 3, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine locates another

network site for the mobile device in response to a user of the mobile device selecting

each of the one or more input entries [col 16 lines 30-col 17 line 50].

8.   As per claims 4,8 Schwartz discloses the conversion engine creates a virtual

network site in response to a user of the mobile device selecting each of the one or

more input entries [HDML cards col 11 line 49-col 12 line 67].

9.   As per claim 5, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine identifies a text entry

field on the network site [col 11 line 65-col 12 line 14], and converts the text entry field

to a selectable link to a virtual network site created by the conversion engine, the virtual

network site for the text entry field providing a corresponding text entry field for the

mobile device [col 12 lines 31-67].

10.   As per claim 6, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine identifies a menu item

on the network site, the menu item including a plurality of menu choices, the conversion

engine converting the text entry field to a selectable link to a virtual network site created

by the conversion engine, the virtual network site for the menu item displaying a link for

each menu choice in the menu item [col 13 lines 39-63]

11.   As per claim 7, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine identifies a radio

button on the network site, the radio button being selectable to enter a Boolean

selection, the conversion engine converting the radio button into a selectable link to a

virtual network site created by the network site, the virtual network site for radio button

displaying a link for each Boolean value of the radio button as inherent feature of button

[col 13 lines 12-38, col16 lines 52-65].

12.   As per claims 9,24 Schwartz discloses the first language is a version of a

Handheld Device Markup Language (HDML), and the second language is a version of

Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) [col 23 lines 22-28].

13.   As per claims 10,25 Schwartz discloses the second language is a version of

Compact HTML (CHTML)[col 10 lines 3-17].

14.   As per claim 11, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine identifies an internal

link on the network site, the internal link on the network site locating a second network

site [link server col 3 lines 37-55].

15.   As per claim 12, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine formats the internal

link and includes the formatted internal links in the content signaled to the mobile

device, the formatted internal links being selectable on the mobile device to generate a

second request for the second network site **without** the content engine converting the

second request to the second language as inherent feature of link server. It is obvious

that the link server connected to a network server, which provides the same language

as the content of the mobile device request, and therefore the converting engine of link

server does not have to do anything.

16.   As per claim 13, Schwartz discloses the conversion engine includes a conversion

engine that is coupleable to a database, the database including an instruction set for the

mobile device, the instruction set being accessible by the conversion engine to convert

the request from the mobile device and the content retrieved from the network site [col 8

lines 33-42].

17.   As per claim 15, Schwartz discloses converting the request from the mobile

device from the first language to the second language [col 8 lines 46-67].

18.   As per claim 16, Schwartz discloses converting the content retrieved from the

network site from the second language to the first language [col 8 lines 46-67].

19.   As per claim 17, Schwartz discloses retrieving content from the network site

includes identifying an internal link on the network site [link server col 3 lines 37-55].

20.   As per claim 18, Schwartz discloses formatting the internal link to be selectable

on the mobile device to generate a second request, the mobile device being able to

generate the second request to be communicable with the network site using the

second language [col 8 lines 46-67].

21.

22.   As per claim 19, Schwartz discloses retrieving a content from the network site

includes identifying one or more input entries on the network site [col 8 lines 46-67].

23.   As per claim 20, Schwartz discloses formatting (converting) the input entries to

appear as selectable links on the mobile device [col 8 lines 46-67].

24.   Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over

Schwartz et al [Schwartz 5,327,559] in view of Jamtgaard et al [Jamtgaard 6,430,624

B1]

25.   As per claim 21, Schwartz did not discloses creating a network page for receiving

an input entry upon one of the selectable links of the input entries being selected.

        Jamtgaard discloses a system permits internet content providers to create a

single piece of content that is reformatted automatically for the different appliances

[Jamtgaard abstract] including creating new pages [Jamtgaard col 14 lines 50-60].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate technique of creating a new network page as

taught by Jamtgaard into the Schwartz's apparatus in order to take advance the link

server capability. Doing so would provide a dynamic and reliable service to different

wireless devices with different markup languages.

26.   As per claim 22, Schwartz- Jamtgaard disclose creating the network page is in

response to a user of the mobile device selecting a link to enter input entries [Jamtgaard

col 14 lines 50-60].

27.   As per claim 23, Schwartz- Jamtgaard disclose signaling an input entered onto

the network page created by the conversion engine to the network site to be received as

input [Jamtgaard col 14 lines 50-60]

28.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-
305-4643.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should
be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

           After Final   (703) 746-7238
           Official: (703) 746-7239
           Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER